

CITY OF MOBILE
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
Minutes of the Meeting
October 25, 2004

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 3:03 p.m. by Chair Cindy Klotz.

Ed Hooker, MHDC Architectural Engineer, called the roll as follows:

Members Present: Lynda Burkett, David Tharp, Bunky Ralph, Cindy Klotz, Tilmon Brown, Cameron Pfeiffer.

Members Absent: Douglas Kearley, Michael Mayberry, Harris Oswalt, Robert Brown, Joe Sackett.

Staff Members Present: Ed Hooker, Anne Crutcher, Devereaux Bemis, Wanda Cochran.

<u>In Attendance</u>	<u>Mailing Address</u>	<u>Item Number</u>
Kim Kearley	10 Wisteria Ave. 36607	02-04/05-CA

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

David Tharp moved to approve the minutes as mailed. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

APPROVAL OF THE MID-MONTH CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS

Bunky Ralph moved to approve the mid-month Certificates of Appropriateness. The motion was seconded by David Tharp and approved.

MID MONTH APPROVALS

1. Applicant's Name: Barbara Jarvis
Property Address: 106 Garnett
Date of Approval: 9/29/04 jss
Work Approved: Make hurricane repairs to roof and porch. Re-roof to match existing shingles, repair damaged porch columns to match original condition in dimension and profile.
2. Applicant's Name: Margaret Pate
Property Address: 1717 Conti Street
Date of Approval: 9/30/04 asc
Work Approved: Roof repair to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Porch repairs to match existing in profile, material and dimension. Install polyurethane material under house attached to decking.
3. Applicant's Name: John Moore
Property Address: 310 Charles Street
Date of Approval: 10/1/04 jdb
Work Approved: Replace current non-original aluminum windows on front of house with 6 over 9 wood double hung windows painted white to match trim. Install four panel wood front door to replace existing modern door.

4. Applicant's Name: William Carroll
Property Address: 205 Everett Street
Date of Approval: 10/4/04 asc
Work Approved: Repair fire damage to include: roof, fascia and soffit, doors and windows (aluminum will be replaced with wood if possible). Repaint to match existing color scheme.

5. Applicant's Name: Robert A. Williams, Jr.
Property Address: 1760 Dauphin Street
Date of Approval: 10/4/2004 weh
Work Approved: Repaint house in existing color scheme:
Body – Old Dauphin Way Gold
Trim – Super White
Window Accent – Claiborne Street Red
Front Porch Deck and Ceiling – Perdido Blue

6. Applicant's Name: Mack Lewis Construction
Property Address: 158 South Jefferson Street
Date of Approval: 10/12/04 weh
Work Approved: Remove existing inappropriate aluminum window and replace with new wood window matching existing in profile and dimension. Re-size existing kitchen window to accommodate new cabinetry. Re-sized window to match existing in pane size and material.

7. Applicant's Name: Arby's Restaurant
Property Address: 659 Government Street
Date of Approval: 10/12/04 weh
Work Approved: Replace storm damaged fence to match existing in material, profile and dimension.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **01-04/05-CA** John Moore
Property Address: 310 Charles Street
Work Requested: Reconfigure enclosed porch by adding framed lattice panels between pilasters as per submitted design.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

2. **02-04/05-CA** William and Emily Hearin Carnival Museum
Property Address: 355 Government Street
Work Requested: Construct 1,475 sf addition to provide entry/gift shop. Remove

existing condenser yard. Relocate existing equipment to parapet-screened roof. Install galvanized iron fence around existing parking lot, all as per submitted plans.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

3. **03-04/05-CA** Rollin C. Broughton
Property Address: 1220 Selma Street
Work Requested: Replace existing chain link fence with new iron fence painted black as per submitted site plan and design.

APPROVED. Certified Record attached.

OTHER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS:

1. Discussion of Rules and Regulations
Bunky Ralph commended the Rules and Regulations Committee for their efforts. She explained that changes had been made in section 9 requiring a vote on “impairment.” Bunky moved to approve the Rules and Regulations. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.
2. Devereaux Bemis, Cindy Klotz and Tilmon Brown reported on the International Preservation Trades Network conference and the interesting workshops that were part of the conference. Tradesmen in preservation crafts presented demonstrations during the conference.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

001-04/05 – CA 310 Charles Street
Applicant: John and Anne Moore
Received: 10/8/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/23/04 1) 10/25/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Remove existing windows and reconstruct exterior walls to resemble enclosed porch with lattice panels between square pilasters as per submitted plans.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile's Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Porches	reconfigure existing infilled porch

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change... Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district...”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Guidelines state that “Historic porches should be maintained and repaired to reflect their period. Particular attention should be paid to handrails, lower rails, balusters, decking, posts/columns, proportions and decorative details... Where rear or side porches are to be enclosed, one recommended method is to preserve the original configuration of columns, handrails, and other important architectural features.”
1. The house is a one story frame Victorian cottage with a side ell.
 2. The area of proposed work is a later shed porch addition as evidenced by a filled-in window in the south wall of the main residence.
 3. At some point in the house's evolution, the shed porch was enclosed to accommodate an additional bathroom.
 4. The proposed alteration calls for the removal of six windows and construction of a solid wall of framed lattice panels placed between square pilasters.
 5. This treatment is typical for enclosed porches.
 6. Examples of this type of construction can be found at 1062 Church Street, the northeast corner of Church and George Streets, and at 351 Charles Street, the southeast corner of Charles and Savannah Streets (diagonally across the street from the subject property.)

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or City departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Board members discussed the style of the pilasters and questioned the compatibility of the existing front porch columns with the proposed columns proposed for use on the enclosure and whether the existing porch windows had gained any historic significance.

Staff reported that the applicant had obtained a mid-month CoA to replace the front porch columns with box columns. Original columns are being rebuilt. Windows on the enclosure have not gained historic significance.

Board members also discussed the need for ventilation that will be required by the code. It would be possible to vent through the roof.

FINDING OF FACT

David Tharp moved that based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing that the Board find the facts as set out in the staff report with the additional fact that the pilasters on the enclosure will match the historic front porch columns. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

Bunky Ralph moved that based on the findings of fact that the proposed work does not constitute a material impairment according to the Guidelines and that a CoA should be issued for the work. The motion was seconded by Lynda Burkett and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/25/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

002-04/05 – CA 355 Government Street
Applicant: William and Emily Hearin Carnival Museum
Received: 10/12/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/27/04 1) 10/25/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Church Street East Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: B-4, General Business
Additional Permits Required: (1) Building
Nature of Project: Construct 1,475 sf addition to provide entry/gift shop. Remove existing condenser yard. Relocate existing equipment to parapet-screened roof. Install galvanized iron fence around existing parking lot, all as per submitted plans.

Additional Information:

The 1872 Bernstein-Bush House, former Museum of the City of Mobile, is soon to be permanent headquarters of the Mobile Carnival Association.

The house served as a private residence until 1922, when Mayor John Bush’s widow Ruth sold the property to Frank L. Roche for use as a funeral home. 1925 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps show the garage addition with a concrete floor. The garage was constructed between existing historic outbuildings.

The proposed addition is to occur at the rear of the property, attached at the east side of the carriage house.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3		Construct addition
3	Fences, Walls and Gates	Install iron fence

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:… Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district…”

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Guidelines state that “The appropriateness of additions shall be measured by the guidelines applicable to new construction. The addition should compliment the design and scale of the main building.”

1. The main structure is two story load bearing masonry with a hipped roof.
2. The proposed addition is one story painted brick veneer to match existing,
3. The addition occurs at a point approximately 50' from the front of the residence.
4. The proposed 1,475 sf addition measures approximately 32' – 8" x approximately 55'.
5. The proposed addition repeats the design of the existing structure by utilizing the following elements:
 - a. Brick veneer painted to match the existing structure;
 - b. Black timberline roof to match that of the main structure, constructed behind main parapet facing Government Street, matching the slope of the existing parapet wall;
 - c. Wood six-over-six, true divided light, windows matching those in the main residence;
 - d. Painted wood French entry doors;
 - e. Lead coated copper concave half-hip awnings over window and entry facing Government Street;
 - f. Decorative ironwork columns and brackets to match that on main structure;
 - g. Relocation of existing carriage lanterns to new addition.

- B. The Guidelines state that Fences “should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
1. The main structure is one a two story load bearing masonry structure.
 2. The proposed fencing is approximately 7' – 6" high, installed in 10' sections.
 3. The 10' sections have crown inserts occurring at the top rail on 5' centers.
 4. The proposed fence is iron painted black.
 5. The Guidelines state that fences may not exceed 6' in height, however, given the scale of the property associated with the proposed fence, 7'-6" is proportionate.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

The architect, Kim Kearley, appeared before the Board. She explained that material colors would match the existing building and showed a colored rendering to illustrate the point. The Board questioned whether the existing handicap ramp would remain. Kearley responded that it would remain. There were also questions concerning the condensing unit location. The unit will be hidden from view behind a parapet on the roof.

There was no one else present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or City departments to read into the record.

BOARD DISCUSSION

There was no Board discussion.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing that the Board find the facts as set out in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that based on the findings of fact that the proposed work does not constitute a material impairment according to the Guidelines and that a CoA be issued for the work. The motion was seconded by Bunky Ralph and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/25/05.

**APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS
CERTIFIED RECORD**

003-04/05 – CA 1220 Selma Street
Applicant: Rollin C. Broughton
Received: 10/14/04 **Meeting Date (s):**
Submission Date + 45 Days: 11/29/04 1) 10/25/04 2) 3)

INTRODUCTION TO THE APPLICATION

Historic District: Oakleigh Garden Historic District
Classification: Contributing
Zoning: R-1, Single Family Residential
Additional Permits Required: (1) Fence
Nature of Project: Replace existing chain link fence with new iron fence painted black as per submitted site plan and design.

APPLICABLE SECTIONS OF GUIDELINES and DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT
Design Review Guidelines for Mobile’s Historic Districts

<u>Sections</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Description of Work</u>
3	Fences, Walls & Gates	Install iron fence

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Section 9, STANDARD OF REVIEW, of the Historic Preservation Ordinance states that “The Board shall not approve any application proposing a Material Change in Appearance unless it finds that the proposed change:… Will not materially impair the architectural or historic value of the building, the buildings on adjacent sites or in the immediate vicinity, or the general visual character of the historic district.

STAFF REPORT

- A. The Guidelines state that Fences “should compliment the building and not detract from it. Design, scale, placement, and materials should be considered along with their relationship to the Historic District.”
 - 1. The main structure is one story frame vernacular residence.
 - 2. The existing fencing is chain link.
 - 3. The proposed fencing is 5’ high iron painted black.

Staff recommends approval of the application as submitted.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

There was no one present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the application. Staff had no comments from the public or City departments to read into the record. The Board questioned staff about the existing picket fence in the front yard and if that fence would remain or be replaced. Staff responded that the picket fence would remain and that the iron fence would be located at the rear of the property to fence a dog. The Board questioned whether the pickets were spaced closely enough to prevent an animal or child from getting through the fence. The Board advised staff to discuss the issue with the applicant.

BOARD DISCUSSION

The Board had no further discussion on the application.

FINDING OF FACT

Bunky Ralph moved that based upon the evidence presented in the application and during the public hearing that the Board find the facts as set out in the staff report. The motion was seconded by Tilmon Brown and approved.

DECISION ON THE APPLICATION

David Tharp moved that based on the findings of fact that the proposed work does not constitute a material impairment according to the Guidelines and that a CoA be issued for the work. The motion was seconded Bunky Ralph and approved.

Certificate of Appropriateness Expiration Date: 10/25/05.